arXiv:1612.03680v4 [math.FA] 27 Dec 2016

DRAFT: A note on conditional risk measures of Orlicz spaces and Orlicz-type modules

José Orihuela, José M. Zapata

Abstract

We consider conditional and dynamic risk measures of Orlicz spaces and study their robust representation. For this purpose, given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{E}, \mathbb{P})$, a sub-$\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{E}$, and a Young function φ, we study the relation between the classical Orlicz space $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and the modular Orlicz-type module $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$; based on conditional set theory, we describe the conditional order continuous dual of a Orlicz-type module; and by using scalarization and modular extensions of conditional risk measures together with elements of conditional set theory, we finally characterize the robust representation of conditional risk measures of Orlicz spaces.

1 Introduction

The study of dual representation of risk measures is an active field within the financial mathematics, cf.[4, 11, 18, 19, 22, 31] among many other references. In particular, the study of risk measures in conditional or dynamic discrete time settings has gained an increasing importance in the recent literature cf.[5, 8, 13, 20, 17, 25, 32].

Whereas many works have studied risk measures defined on Orlicz spaces cf.[9, 12, 31, 33, 34], to the best of our knowledge, conditional and dynamic risk measures have been studied only in the case that they are defined on L^p spaces cf.[8, 13] or modular extensions of L^p spaces cf.[17, 25, 32]. As explained by [36], one of the advantages of consider Orlicz spaces is that, in many cases, convex risk measures defined on L^p spaces have effective domain whose interior is empty, and this makes impossible to apply subdifferentiabilty results; however, sometimes one can find a suitable finer Orlicz space on which a convex risk measure is defined, obtaining a domain with non-empty interior, for which subdifferentiabilty results apply. Also, Fritelli et al. [7] found a connection between Orlicz spaces and the theory of utility functions. In addition, this relation has applications to the study of no-arbitrage conditions cf.[21, 30]. Thus, Orlicz spaces have a key role in the study of dynamic problems in mathematical finance.

Thereby, the purpose of this paper is to extend the notions of conditional and dynamic convex risk measure, defining the notions of conditional and dy-

namic convex risk measure of Orlicz spaces and study their dual representation. For instance, given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{E}, \mathbb{P})$, a sub-$\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{E}$, and two Young functions $\varphi, \psi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty]$ with $\psi \leq \varphi$, a conditional convex risk measure is a function $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ which is monotone (decreasing), $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex and $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant. Then, based on the dual pair $\langle L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})\rangle$ where $\varphi^*(y) := \sup_{x\geq 0}(xy - \varphi(x))$ is the conjugate Young function of φ, we will study under which conditions we have a dual representation $\rho(x) = \bigvee \left\{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \alpha(y)\,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})\right\}$ for $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$; and when this representation is attained.

The works that study the dual representation of dynamic and conditional risk measures employ mainly two types of strategies. In a first stage, a technique called scalarization is adopted; more specifically, these works try to reduce the conditional case to the static case, which is known and treatable cf.[13, 8]. In a second stage, with the aim of providing a tailored analytic framework for the study of conditional risk measures, some recent works have developed new models of functional analysis: a modular based approach is proposed by Filipovic et al.[16] where some theorems of convex analysis are extended to $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-modules (also see [17, 23, 24, 36, 38]); and in a more abstract level in [14] it was developed the theory of conditional sets, providing a formal formulation, which is in some precise sense stable and consistent with respect to the measure algebra associated to a probability space, and is closely related to the theory of Boolean-valued models of set theory cf.[6, 10, 26]. Therefore, in this paper we will employ a mix of both techniques: where possible we will try to reduce to the static case, where not, we will make use of tools from the modular and conditional approach.

The Orlicz-type modules were introduced by Vogelpoth [36]. Based on a modular approach, he considered the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-module generated by $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$; more precisely, the Orlicz-type module is given by $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = L^0(\mathcal{F})L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$. Then, we will show that every conditional convex risk measure $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ can be uniquely extended to a conditional convex risk measure $\bar{\rho} : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$, and prove that the dual representation of the former is equivalent to the dual representation of the latter. We will also prove that the attainability of the representation is equivalent to the so-called Lebesgue property of ρ, and also to the conditional compactness of the conditional sublevel sets of $\bar{\rho}$.

The manuscript is structured as follows: Section 2 is devoted to some preliminaries. In Section 3 we study the relation between the classical Orlicz space $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and the Orlicz-type module $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Section 4 is devoted to the study of the conditional order continuous dual of a Orlicz-type module. Finally, in Section 5 we introduce the notions of conditional and dynamic convex risk measures and study their robust representation.

2 Preliminaries and notation

Let us start by describing the setting and notation of this paper. For this purpose, we will review the different elements of the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-theory (see [16,

23, 38]) and, at the same time, we will identify them with the corresponding notions within of the conditional set theory ([14, 38]), describing how the former framework is embedded in the latter when we assume on the different objects the necessary stability properties.

Let us fix an underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{E}, \mathbb{P})$ and let us also consider some sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{E}$, which will remain fixed throughout this paper. We will denote by $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ the space (of equivalence classes) of $\mathcal{F}$-measurable random variables, which equipped with the order of almost sure dominance is a Dedekind complete Riesz space. We will follow the common practice of identifying random variables and measurable sets which agree almost surely. By doing so, we can also identify the σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ with the measure algebra associated to $\mathcal{F}$, which is a complete Boolean algebra. We define the set of partitions of Ω to $\mathcal{F}$ as follows:[1]

$$\Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F}) := \left\{ \{A_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{F} \,;\, \Omega = \bigvee_k A_k,\ A_i \wedge A_j = \emptyset,\ \forall i \neq j,\ i, j \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Given a non-empty subset M of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$, we define the *countable concatenation hull* of M by

$$\overline{M}^{cc} := \left\{ \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_k \,;\, \{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F}),\ \{x_k\} \subset M \right\}.$$

We will say that a subset M of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ has the *countable concatenation property*, if $M = \overline{M}^{cc}$. Given a subset M of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ with the countable concatenation property, we can define an equivalent relation on $M \times \mathcal{F}$ where the class of (x, A) is denoted by

$$x|A := \{(y, B) \,;\, A = B,\ 1_A x = 1_B y\}.$$

By doing so, we find that the quotient set $\mathbf{M}$ is a *conditional set* as it satisfies the axioms of Definition 2.1 of [14]. Namely, inspection shows that

1. $x|A = y|B$ implies that $A = B$;
2. (Consistency) $x|A = y|A$ and $B \leq A$ implies $x|B = y|B$;
3. (Stability) for $\{x_k\} \subset M$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, there exists a unique $x \in M$ such that $x|A_k = x_k|A_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Notice that, for $\{x_k\} \subset M$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, $x = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_k$ satisfies that $x|A_k = x_k|A_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The element x is called the *concatenation of* $\{x_k\}$ along $\{A_k\}$.

In particular, $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ defines a conditional set, which will be denoted by $\mathbf{L}^0$. Also, $L^0(\mathcal{F})$ obviously has the countable concatenation property, therefore it also defines a conditional set; moreover, in [14, Theorem 4.4] it is proved that this conditional set is a copy of the so-called *conditional real numbers* (see [14, Definition 4.3]). Thus, we will use the notation $\mathbf{R}$ for denoting the conditional set

[1] It is known that every partition of Ω to $\mathcal{F}$ is at most countable.

generated by $L^0(\mathcal{F})$. Likewise, the following sets have the countable concatenation property: $L^0_+(\mathcal{F}) = \{x \in L^0(\mathcal{F})\,;\, x \geq 0\}$; $L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F}) = \{x \in L^0(\mathcal{F})\,;\, x > 0\}$; $\bar{L^0}(\mathcal{F})$, defined as the space of all (equivalence classes of) $\mathcal{F}$-measurable random variables whose values are in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$; and $L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N})$, the set of random variables which take values in $\mathbb{N}$. Then, the corresponding conditional sets are denoted by $\mathbf{R}^+$, $\mathbf{R}^{++}$, $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ and $\mathbf{N}$, respectively. In addition, since the elements of $L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N})$ are step-functions which take values in $\mathbb{N}$, i.e. $L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N}) = \overline{\mathbb{N}}^{cc}$, one can identify the conditional set $\mathbf{N}$ with the *conditional natural numbers* (see 5 of [14, Examples 2.3]).

The elements $\mathbf{x} = x|\Omega$ are called *conditional elements*[3]. Throughout this paper, some conditional subsets will be required to be defined by describing their conditional elements. Namely, let ϕ be certain statement which can be true of false for the conditional elements of some conditional set $\mathbf{C}$. Also, let us suppose that there exists some $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}$ such that $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is true. Then, we denote by $[\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C}\,;\, \phi(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is true}]$ the conditional set generated by $\overline{\{x \in C\,;\, \phi(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is true}\}}^{cc}$.[4]

Also, if C has the countable concatenation property and $A \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\mathbf{C}|A := \{x|B\,;\, x \in C,\, B \leq A\}$ is also a conditional set (considering as σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}_A$, the trace of $\mathcal{F}$ on A), and is called a *conditional subset* (on A) of $\mathbf{L}^0$ (see [14, Definition 2.8]). A conditional subset $\mathbf{C}|A$ is said to be *conditionally included* in $\mathbf{D}|B$ if $\mathbf{C}|A \subset \mathbf{D}|B$, in accordance with [14], we will use the notation $\mathbf{C}|A \sqsubset \mathbf{D}|B$. In [14] it is proved that the collection of all objects $\mathbf{C}|A$ is a complete Boolean algebra, when it is endowed with the operations of *conditional union* $\sqcup$, *conditional intersection* $\sqcap$ and *conditional complement* $^{\sqsubset}$ (see [14, Corollary 2.10]). We do not give the construction; instead, we refer to the proof of [14, Theorem 2.9].

It is also important to recall the *conditional Cartesian product* of conditional sets (see [14, Definition 2.14]). Suppose that $\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{M}$ are two conditional subsets of $\mathbf{L}^0$ (on 1). Then, we define their conditional product as follows:

$$\mathbf{L} \bowtie \mathbf{M} := \{(x|A, y|A)\,;\, A \in \mathcal{F},\, x \in L,\, y \in M\}\,,$$

which is a conditional set as it satisfies the axioms of [14, Definition 2.1].

If we have an application $f : L \to M$ between conditional subsets with the countable concatenation property, according to [14, Definition 2.17] f is a *stable function* if it preserves countable concatenations, i.e. $f(\sum 1_{A_k} x_k) = \sum 1_{A_k} f(x_k)$. In this case, if $G_f = \{(x, f(x))\,;\, x \in L\}$ is the graph of f, then $\mathbf{G_f} := \{(x|A, y|A)\,;\, (x, y) \in G_f,\, A \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is the *conditional graph* of a *conditional function* $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{L} \to \mathbf{M}$, as explained in [14, Definition 2.17].

For $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{L}^0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we will say $\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{y}$ (resp. $\mathbf{x} < \mathbf{y}$) on A whenever $\mathbb{P}(x \leq y|A) = 1$ (resp. $\mathbb{P}(x < y|A) = 1$), this defines a *conditional partial order* as in [14, Definition 2.15]. Further, the *conditional supremums* and *conditional infimums* are defined in term of the partial ordered set $(L^0(\mathcal{E}), \leq)$, i.e. if $\mathbf{C}$ is a

[3] In [14] it is used a different definition of conditional element, but as mentioned in [38] both objects can be identified due to the axiom of consistency

[4] As explained in [14], we use this set-builder notation, because the set of conditional elements $\{\mathbf{x}\,;\, \phi(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is true}\}$ is not necessarily a conditional set.

conditional subset of $\mathbf{L}^0$ (on 1) we have $\mathbf{sup}\,\mathbf{C} := \bigvee C|\Omega$ and $\mathbf{inf}\,\mathbf{C} := \bigwedge C|\Omega$. This conditional order, when restricted to $\mathbf{R}$, becomes a conditional total order as in [14, Definition 2.15]; that is, for every $\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{R}$ there exists $A, B, C \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{s}$ on A, $\mathbf{r} > \mathbf{s}$ on B and $\mathbf{r} < \mathbf{s}$ on C.

Let us consider a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ in $L^0(\mathcal{E})$. Each $n \in L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N})$ is a concatenation of a sequence $\{n_k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ along a partition $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, i.e. $n = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} n_k$. Then, we can define $x_n := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_{n_k}$. It turns out, that the family $\{x_n\}_{n\in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$ is a *stable family* as in [14, Definition 2.20]; therefore, we can construct a *conditional sequence* $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}}$ as described in [14, Definition 2.20]. Conversely, given a conditional sequence $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}}$, we can consider a sequence $\{x_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. We see that, there is a bijection between sequences of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$, and conditional sequences of $\mathbf{L}^0$.

Suppose that E is a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-submodule of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ with the countable concatenation property, then $\mathbf{E}$ is a *conditional vector space* in the sense of [14, Definition 5.1]. Suppose that $f : E \to F$ is a homomorphism of $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-modules, then inspection shows that f is stable and the corresponding conditional function $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{F}$ is a *conditionally linear function* as it satisfies [14, Definition 5.1] and, conversely, for any conditionally linear conditional function $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{F}$, we have that $f : E \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is a stable homomorphism of $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-modules.

Likewise, let $f : E \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ be an application which is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex, i.e. $f(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \leq \lambda f(x) + (1-\lambda)f(y)$ for every $\lambda \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$ with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$ and $x, y \in E$. Then, by [16, Theorem 3.2], we have that $1_A f(1_A z) = 1_A f(z)$ for all $z \in E$, $A \in \mathcal{F}$. From this fact, we can obtain that f is stable. Consequently, it defines a conditional function $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{R}$, which is *conditionally convex* in the sense of [14, Definition 5.1]. Again, the converse is also true.

Suppose that $\|\cdot\| : E \to L^0_+(\mathcal{F})$ is a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm, i.e.: $\|\lambda x\| = |\lambda|\|x\|$ for all $\lambda \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$ and $x \in E$; $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$ for all $x, y \in E$; and, $x = 0$ whenever $\|x\| = 0$. In particular, $\|\cdot\|$ is stable; therefore, it defines a conditional function $\|\cdot\| : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ which is called a *conditional norm* (see [14, Definition 5.11]). For instance, the absolute value $|\cdot| : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}^+$ is a conditional norm. Other important examples, which are introduced by Filipovic et al.[16], are the L^p-type modules. More specifically, given $1 \leq p \leq +\infty$, we define $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_p : L^0(\mathcal{E}) \to \bar{L}^0(\mathcal{F})$ by

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_p = \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\left[\lim_n |x|^p \wedge n|\mathcal{F}\right]^{\frac{1}{p}}, & \text{if } p < +\infty; \\ \bigwedge\left\{\lambda \in \bar{L}^0(\mathcal{F})\,;\, |x| \leq \lambda\right\}, & \text{if } p = +\infty, \end{cases}$$

which is a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm for the L^p-type module $L^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) := \left\{x \in L^0(\mathcal{E})\,;\, \|x|\mathcal{F}\|_p \in L^0(\mathcal{F})\right\}$. Inspection shows that $L^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ has the countable concatenation property. The corresponding conditional vector space will be denoted by $\mathbf{L}^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, or simply $\mathbf{L}^p$, and can be endowed with the corresponding conditional norm $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_p : \mathbf{L}^p \to \mathbf{R}^+$.

Guo et al.[25] proved that $L^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{L^p(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$, which allows a better understanding of the relation between $L^p(\mathcal{E})$ and $L^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$.

By using this equality for $p = 1$, the classical conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}] : L^1(\mathcal{E}) \to L^1(\mathcal{F})$ is extended to $L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ as follows: For $x \in L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, which is of the form $x = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_k$ with $\{x_k\} \subset L^1(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, we define

$\mathbb{E}[x|\mathcal{F}] := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k}\mathbb{E}[x_k|\mathcal{F}]$. An easy check shows that this definition does not depend on the choice of $\{x_k\}$ and $\{A_k\}$. Clearly, this application is stable, then we consider the conditional function $\mathbb{E}[\cdot|\mathcal{F}] : \mathbf{L}^1 \to \mathbf{R}$.

Also, let us recall the Orlicz-type modules. Let $\varphi : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty]$ be a Young function, i.e. φ is an increasing left-continuous convex function finite on a neighborhood of 0 with $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{x\to+\infty} \varphi(x) = +\infty$. The Orlicz-type module corresponding to φ is defined by

$$L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) := \left\{x \in L^0(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right] \in L^0(\mathcal{F}), \text{ for some } \lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\right\}.$$

It is easy to check that $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ has the countable concatenation property. Then, the corresponding conditional vector space is denoted by $\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ or simply $\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$ as long as $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ are fixed.

In [36], it is introduced

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi} := \bigwedge \left\{\lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F}) \,;\, \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right] \le 1\right\}, \tag{1}$$

which is a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm for $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Consequently, we have a conditional norm $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi} : \mathbf{L}^{\varphi} \to \mathbf{R}^{++}$ which is a conditional version of the classical Luxemburg norm; therefore, hereafter $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi}$ will be referred to as the conditional Luxemburg norm.

An important remark, it is that the L^p-type modules are Orlicz-type modules. Indeed, for $1 \le p < +\infty$ let us define $\phi(t) := t^p$ and for $p = \infty$ let us define $\phi(t) := \infty$ whenever $t \ge 1$ and 0 otherwise, then inspection shows that $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = L^p_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi} = \|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_p$. It is also easy to prove that $L^{\infty}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \subset L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \subset L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Further, $\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$ is a conditional lattice-normed space, in the sense that $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$ with $\mathbf{x} \le \mathbf{y}$ implies $\|\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi} \le \|\mathbf{y}|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi}$.

If $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ is a conditional normed space, the collection $\mathcal{B} := \{x + B_{\varepsilon} \,;\, x \in E,\ \varepsilon \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\}$, where $B_{\varepsilon} := \{x \in E \,;\, \|x\| \le \varepsilon\}$ is a topological basis, which generates the topology induced by $\|\cdot\|$ (see [16]). Also, notice that $\mathcal{B}$ is a stable family. Then, according to [14, Proposition 3.5], the collection of conditional subsets $\mathbf{O}|A$ where O is open for this topology and $A \in \mathcal{F}$, defines a *conditional topology* in the sense of [16, Definition 3.1], which is precisely the topology induced by the conditional norm $\|\cdot\| : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{R}$. In particular, $(\mathbf{R}, |\cdot|)$, $(\mathbf{L}^p, \|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_p)$ and $(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}, \|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi})$ can be endowed with conditional topologies.

Consider two $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-submodules E, F of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ with the countable concatenation property. We say that E, F is a random duality pair with respect to the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-bilinear form $\langle , \rangle : E \times F \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ if $\langle x, y\rangle = 0$ for all $y \in F$ if, and only if, $x = 0$; and $\langle x, y\rangle = 0$ for all $x \in E$ if, and only if, $x = 0$ (see [24, Definition 3.19]). Then, if we consider the corresponding conditional vector spaces $\mathbf{E}$, $\mathbf{F}$ and the conditional function $\langle , \rangle : \mathbf{E} \bowtie \mathbf{F} \to \mathbf{R}$, we obtain a *conditional dual pair* as in [24, Definition 5.6].

For a given random duality pair E, F (both with the countable concatenation property; for instance, $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, $L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$), we can define the weak topologies. Namely, $\mathcal{U} := \{x + U_{Q,\varepsilon} \,;\, Q \subset F \text{ finite },\ \varepsilon \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\}$ is a base for the weak

topology $\sigma(E,F)$. However, we have that $\mathcal{U}$ is not necessarily a stable family, and we cannot directly apply [14, Proposition 3.5] just as we have done for $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-normed modules. Instead, we need to stabilize the topology by considering the collection

$$\mathcal{U}_{cc} := \left\{ \sum 1_{A_k} U_k \,;\, \{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F}),\, U_k \in \mathcal{U} \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \right\},$$

which is the basis for a finer topology; let us denote it by $\sigma_{cc}(E,F)$. In addition, Example 1.4 of [32], shows a situation in which $\sigma(E,F)$ is strictly coarser than $\sigma_{cc}(E,F)$, which proves that, in fact, $\mathcal{U}$ is not stable.

By doing so, $\mathcal{U}_{cc}$ is already a stable family and [14, Proposition 3.5] applies. Then, the *conditional weak topology*[5] $\sigma(\mathbf{E},\mathbf{F})$ is the collection of conditional subsets $\mathbf{O}|A$ where O is $\sigma_{cc}(E,F)$-open and $A \in \mathcal{F}$. In particular, since $\sigma_{cc}(E,F)$ is finer than $\sigma(E,F)$, we have that for any $\sigma(E,F)$-open subset O with the countable concatenation property, it holds that $\mathbf{O}$ is conditionally $\sigma(\mathbf{E},\mathbf{F})$-open. However, the converse is not true (as [32, Example 1.4] shows).

It is also important to recall the notion of *conditionally compact* conditional set (see [14, Definition 3.24]). Suppose that $\mathbf{K}$ is a conditional subset of $\mathbf{L}^0$, and consider some conditional topology $\mathcal{T}$ on $\mathbf{K}$. Then $\mathbf{K}$ is conditionally compact, if for every conditional family of conditionally open subsets $\{\mathbf{O_i}\}$ such that $\mathbf{K} \sqsubset \sqcup \mathbf{O_i}$, there exists a conditional subset $[\mathbf{i_k}\,;\, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbf{N},\, \mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{n}]$ with $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}$, such that $\mathbf{K} \sqsubset \underset{\mathbf{1}\leq\mathbf{k}\leq\mathbf{n}}{\sqcup} \mathbf{O_{i_k}}$.

3 The relation between $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$ and $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$

Let us fix a Young function $\varphi : [0,+\infty) \to [0,+\infty]$, which will be the same in the remainder of this paper.

Let us start by studying the relation between the classical Orlicz space $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$ and the Orlicz-type module $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Vogelpoth [36] proved the following product structure $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = L^0(\mathcal{F})L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$. Then, analogously as was made in [25] for L^p-type modules, we can prove the following result:

Proposition 1 *The $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-module $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ has the countable concatenation property; moreover,*

$$\overline{L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})}^{cc} = L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof.

It is clear that $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ has the countable concatenation property.

Now, since $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}) \subset L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, it follows that

$$\overline{L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})}^{cc} \subset L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}).$$

For the reverse inclusion, suppose that $x \in L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Since $L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = L^0(\mathcal{F})L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, we can put $x = \eta x_0$ with $\eta \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$ and $x_0 \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$. Let us define $A_k :=$

[5] This is not exactly how the conditional weak topologies was introduced in [14]; however, it is not difficult to prove that both approaches are equivalent.

$(k-1 \leq |\eta| < k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $x = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k}\eta x_0$. Besides, since $|1_{A_k}\eta x_0| \leq k|x_0|$ with $x_0 \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, and $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$ is a solid subspace of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$, it follows that $x_k := 1_{A_k}\eta x_0 \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$. We conclude that $x = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_k \in \overline{L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$. ■

Apart from the Luxemburg norm, there are other relevant equivalent norms for $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$. For instance, we can consider the so-called Orlicz norm, which has a different formulation given by the so-called Amemiya norm (see [2]). Namely, for $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, the Ameya norm is given by

$$\|x\|_\varphi^A := \inf\left\{\frac{1}{r}\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(r|x|)\right]\right) \,;\, r > 0\right\}$$

In this paper, we will be interested in the modular form of the Amemiya norm. Thereby, for $x \in L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, we define

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A := \bigwedge\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi(\lambda|x|)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) \,;\, \lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\right\}. \tag{2}$$

In the appendix of this paper, it is proved that the formula above defines a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm, which is equivalent to $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi$ (see Proposition 25). The corresponding conditional norm will be referred to as conditional Amemiya norm.

For the next result, we also need to recall the following spaces. For $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and for a given L^0-normed module $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ Guo et al.[25] defined the following spaces

$$L^p(E) := \{x \in E \,;\, \|\|x\|\|_p < +\infty\},$$

for which $|||x|||_p := \|\|x\|\|_p$ defines a norm.

Then, we have the following result:

Proposition 2 *For every $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, it holds*

$$\|\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A\|_1 \leq \|x\|_\varphi^A.$$

In particular, it follows that $L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}) \subset L^1(L^\varphi_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}))$.

Proof. By definition of the Amemiya norm, we have that for each real number $r > 0$,

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A \leq \frac{1}{r}(1 + \mathbb{E}[\varphi(r|x|)|\mathcal{F}]).$$

By taking expectations

$$\|\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A\|_1 = \mathbb{E}[\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A] \leq \frac{1}{r}(1 + \mathbb{E}[\varphi(r|x|)]) \leq +\infty.$$

Finally, by taking infimums on $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$

$$\|\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A\|_1 \leq \|x\|_\varphi^A < +\infty.$$

and the proof is complete. ■

Let us recall that a conditional sequence $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}$ in a conditional normed space $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ *conditionally converges* to $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{E}$ if for every $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}^{++}$ there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x_n}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{m}$. Also, $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}$ is said to be *conditionally Cauchy*, if for every $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}^{++}$, there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\|\mathbf{x_p} - \mathbf{x_q}\| \leq \mathbf{r}$ for all $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q} \geq \mathbf{m}$ (both notions are introduced in [14]).

Then, we have the following result:

Proposition 3 *The conditional normed space $(\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}, \|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi})$ is conditionally Banach[6], i.e. every conditionally Cauchy sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x_n}\}$ conditionally converges to some $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}$.*

Proof.

In [14, Theorem 3.3.3], it is shown that the L^0-normed module $(L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), \|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi})$ is complete in the sense that every Cauchy net converges in $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$.

Now, let $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}$ be a conditional Cauchy sequence in $\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Then, we can consider the stable family $\{x_n\}_{n\in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$. We have that $L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})$ is upward directed, and therefore $\{x_n\}_{n\in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$ is a net indexed by $L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})$. Furthermore, since $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}$ is conditionally Cauchy, it follows that $\{x_n\}_{n\in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$ is Cauchy. Since $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ is complete, the net $\{x_n\}_{n\in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$ converges to some $x_0 \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. If follows that the conditional sequence $\{\mathbf{x_n}\}$ conditionally converges to $\mathbf{x}_0$. ■

4 Duality in Orlicz-type modules

Given a subset $H \subset L^0(\mathcal{E})$, the Köthe dual of H is given by

$$H^x := \left\{ y \in L^0(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, xy \in L^1(\mathcal{E}),\ \text{for all } x \in H \right\}.$$

A well-known result of the theory of Orlicz spaces (see [28, 37]) is the following identity

$$L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) = [L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x, \tag{3}$$

where $\varphi^*(y) := \sup_{x\geq 0}(xy - \varphi(x))$ is the conjugate Young function of φ.

We will show that the equality above naturally extends to the modular case. For this purpose, suppose that $\mathbf{H}$ is a conditional subset of $\mathbf{L}^0$, we can consider a conditional version of the Köthe dual. Namely,

$$\mathbf{H}^x := \left[\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{L}^0 \,;\, \mathbf{xy} \in \mathbf{L}^1,\ \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{H} \right].$$

Then, we will prove that

$$\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*} = [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^x.$$

For a given $\mathbf{y} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^x$, then we can define an application

$$\mu_y : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F}), \quad \mu_y(x) := \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}].$$

Clearly, μ_y is stable. Consequently, it generates a conditional function

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}} : \mathbf{L}^{\varphi} \to \mathbf{R}.$$

[6]The notion on conditionally Banach normed space was also introduced in [14].

Proposition 4 *Suppose that $f : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is a stable function, which is also monotone and convex, then the conditional function $\boldsymbol{f} : \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi} \to \boldsymbol{R}$ is conditionally norm continuous and conditionally convex. Moreover, if f is linear, then $\boldsymbol{f}$ is conditionally linear.*

Proof.

By adapting the proof of [36, Theorem 4.1.3][7] to the present setting, we can obtain that $\mathbf{f} : \mathbf{L}^{\varphi} \to \mathbf{R}$ is conditionally norm continuous.

Let us show that $\mathbf{f}$ is conditionally convex. Indeed, suppose that $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}$ with $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$. Let us show that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{ax}+(\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{a})\mathbf{y}) \leq \mathbf{af}(\mathbf{x})+(\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{a})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})$. If $a \in \mathbb{R}$ the result is clear, due to the convexity of f. If $a \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{cc}$ also is clear due to the stability and convexity of f. For arbitrary $\mathbf{a}$, we proceed as follows. Let us pick some dense and countable set $H \subset \mathbb{R}$, $H = \{h_1, h_2, ...\}$ (for instance $H = \mathbb{Q}$), and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_1 := (a \leq h_1 < a + \frac{1}{n})$ and $A_k := (a \leq h_k < a + \frac{1}{n}) - \bigvee_{i=1}^{k-1} A_i$ for $k > 1$, and put

$$a_n := 1 \wedge \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} h_k.$$

For $n \in L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N})$ of the form $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 1_{B_i} n_i$ with $\{n_i\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\{A_i\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, we define $a_n := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} 1_{B_i} a_{n_i}$.

Then, $\{\mathbf{a_n}\}_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}}$ is a conditional sequence, which conditionally converges to $\mathbf{a}$. Also, note that $a_n \in \overline{H}^{cc} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{cc}$ and $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbf{a_n} \leq \mathbf{1}$. Then

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a_n x} + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{a_n})\mathbf{y}) \leq \mathbf{a_n f}(\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{a_n})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}), \text{ for all } \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}.$$

Since $\mathbf{f}$ is conditionally continuous, by taking conditional limits, we obtain

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{ax} + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{a})\mathbf{y}) \leq \mathbf{af}(\mathbf{x}) + (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{a})\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}).$$

If f is linear, by following a similar argument, we get that $\mathbf{f}$ is conditionally linear. ■

Corollary 5 *Let $\boldsymbol{y} \in [\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}]^x$, then the conditional function*

$$\boldsymbol{\mu_y} : \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi} \to \boldsymbol{R}, \quad \boldsymbol{\mu_y}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{xy}|\mathcal{F}],$$

is conditionally norm continuous.

Proof. We can suppose $\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{0}$; otherwise, we can put $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^+ - \mathbf{y}^-$ and argue on $\mathbf{y}^+$ and $\mathbf{y}^-$. Then, the application μ_y is monotone, convex and stable, and the result follows by Proposition 4. ■

[7] In the literature some issues regarding the countable concatenation property have been reported cf.[24, 38]. The proof of [36, Theorem 4.1.3] involves infinite countable concatenations; therefore, it seems that in the statement of [36, Theorem 4.1.3] should be added the extra-hypothesis on E of having the countable concatenation property. The module $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ has the countable concatenation; moreover, the proof of [36, Theorem 4.1.3] perfectly works for this particular case, and the results applies to this case as Proposition 4 asserts.

Let $(\mathbf{E}, \|\cdot\|)$ be a conditional normed space. In [14] it is introduced the *conditional topological dual* $\mathbf{E}^*$, which is defined at the conditional set whose conditional elements are conditionally linear continuous functions $\boldsymbol{\mu} : \mathbf{E} \to \mathbf{R}$, and is endowed with the conditional norm

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}\| := \mathbf{sup}\left[|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x})| \,;\, \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \mathbf{1}\right].$$

Consequently, in view of Corollary 5, for $\mathbf{y} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^x$, we have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*$ and

$$|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{xy}|\mathcal{F}]| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}}\| \|\mathbf{x}|\mathcal{F}\|_{\varphi}, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi}.$$

We have the following result:

Proposition 6 *It holds*

$$\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*} = [\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}]^x.$$

Proof.

Due to Proposition 1, we have $\overline{L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})}^{cc} = L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, also we know that $L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) = [L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x$.

Thus, it suffices to show that

$$\overline{[L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x}^{cc} = [L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})]^x_{\mathcal{F}},$$

where

$$[L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})]^x_{\mathcal{F}} := \left\{y \in L^0(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, xy \in L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \text{ for all } x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})\right\},$$

which is the generating set of $[\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^x$.

First, inspection shows that $[L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})]^x_{\mathcal{F}}$ has the countable concatenation property. Then, for the inclusion "$\subset$" it suffices to show that $[L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x \subset [L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})]^x_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Let us take $y \in [L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x$, and let us show that $xy \in L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ for all $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. Indeed, for $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, due to Proposition 1, we have that $x = \sum 1_{A_k} x_k$ with $\{x_k\} \subset L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. Therefore, $xy = \sum 1_{A_k} x_k y \in \sum 1_{A_k} L^1(\mathcal{E}) \subset L^1_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$.

For the reverse inclusion, let us take $y \in [L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})]^x_{\mathcal{F}}$. Let us pick some $\sum 1_{A_k} r_k > \|\mu_y\|$ where r_k are positive real number for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$.

We claim that $1_{A_k} y \in [L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x$. Indeed, for a given $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[|x 1_{A_k} y||\mathcal{F}] = 1_{A_k} \mathbb{E}[|x|1_{A_k} \operatorname{sgn}(y) y|\mathcal{F}] \leq 1_{A_k} \|\mu_y\| \|1_{A_k} x|\mathcal{F}\|^A_{\varphi} \leq r_k \|1_{A_k} x|\mathcal{F}\|^A_{\varphi}.$$

By taking expectations

$$\mathbb{E}[|x 1_{A_k} y|] \leq \mathbb{E}[r_k \|1_{A_k} x|\mathcal{F}\|^A_{\varphi}],$$

and the right side of the inequality above is finite, in view of Proposition 2.

Consequently, $x 1_{A_k} y \in L^1(\mathcal{E})$. Since $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ is arbitrary, we obtain that $1_{A_k} y_k \in [L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x$; hence, $y \in \overline{[L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})]^x}^{cc}$. ■

In the following definition we recall some notions from the theory of Riesz spaces.

Definition 7 *An linear application $\mu : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$:*

1. *is order bounded, if for every $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, there exists $y \in L^0_+(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\mu([-|x|, |x|]) \subset [-y, y]$;*

2. *is order continuous if, μ is order bounded, and for every downward directed subset D of $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\bigwedge D = 0$, it holds that $\bigwedge\limits_{x\in D} |\mu(x)| = 0$.*

3. *is σ-order continuous if, μ is order bounded, and for every decreasing sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\bigwedge x_n = 0$, it holds that $\bigwedge |\mu(x_n)| = 0$.*

Let us introduce a conditional version of the classical notion of Riesz space theory of order continuity.

Definition 8 *A conditionally linear function $\boldsymbol{\mu} : \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi} \to \boldsymbol{R}$ is:*

1. *conditionally order bounded if μ is order bounded;*

2. *conditionally order continuous if it is conditionally order bounded and for any conditionally downward directed[8] subset $\boldsymbol{D}$ of $\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}$ with $\boldsymbol{\inf D = 0}$, it holds that $\boldsymbol{\inf\limits_{x\in D} |\mu(x)| = 0}$.*

We denote by $[\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n$ the conditional set of *conditionally order continuous* and conditionally linear functions $\boldsymbol{\mu} : \mathbf{L}^{\varphi} \to \mathbf{R}$, which is referred to as the *conditional order dual*.

The following result is an adaptation of [25, Lemma 2.16(2)] to the present setting.

Lemma 9 *[25] Let $\boldsymbol{E}$ be a conditional set, C a subset of E, and $\boldsymbol{f} : \boldsymbol{E} \to \boldsymbol{R}$ a conditional function, then*

$$\boldsymbol{\sup}\left[\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x})\,;\, x \in \overline{C}^{cc}\right] = \bigvee \{f(x)\,;\, x \in C\}\,|\Omega.$$

Proposition 10 *Let $\mu : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ be a stable linear function, the following are equivalent:*

1. *μ is σ-order continuous;*

2. *μ is order continuous;*

3. *$\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is conditionally order continuous.*

In this case, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is conditionally linear and conditionally norm continuous, i.e. $[\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n \sqsubset [\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}]^*$.

[8] In [14] it is introduced the notion of direction.

Proof.

$1 \Leftrightarrow 2$: It is known that $L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is a Riesz space which is Dedekind complete and order separable (see [37] for all this terminology relative to Riesz spaces). Also it is clear that $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ is a Riesz space. Then, according to [37, Theorem 84.4(i)], we find that μ is order continuous if, and only if, μ is σ-order continuous.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$: First, let us show that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is conditionally linear. Indeed, if $\mu : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is an order continuous linear stable application. From the theory of Riesz spaces, it has a Jordan Decomposition $\mu = \mu^+ - \mu^-$ (see [37, Theorem 84.4(i)]) where μ^+, μ^- are linear functions with

$$\mu^+(x) := \bigvee \{\mu(y) \, ; \, 0 \leq y \leq x\} \quad \text{ for } x \geq 0, \tag{4}$$

and for arbitrary x, $\mu^+(x) = \mu^+(x^+) - \mu^-(x^-)$ and $\mu^-(x) = (-\mu)^+(x)$.

By using this definition we have that μ^+ and μ^- are also stable. Then, due to Proposition 4, we obtain that $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}^+ - \boldsymbol{\mu}^-$ is conditionally linear and conditionally norm continuous.

Finally, the result is clear, as every conditionally downward directed set is defined from a downward directed set (with the countable concatenation property).

$3 \Rightarrow 1$: Suppose that $\{x_n\}$ is a decreasing sequence such that $\bigwedge x_n = 0$. As commented in the section of preliminaries, we can extend this sequence to a stable family $\{x_n\}_{n \in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})}$. Then, the conditional set $\mathbf{D} := [\mathbf{x_n} \, ; \, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{N}]$ in conditionally downward directed and satisfies $\mathbf{inf\ D} = \mathbf{0}$, due to Lemma 9 (and using that $\overline{\mathbb{N}}^{cc} = L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})$). Again, by Lemma 9 we have

$$\bigwedge \{|\mu(x_n)| \, ; \, n \in \mathbb{N}\}|\Omega = \bigwedge \{|\mu(x_n)| \, ; \, n \in L^0(\mathcal{F},\mathbb{N})\}|\Omega = \inf_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{D}} |\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{x})| = \mathbf{0}.$$

Therefore, we have that $\bigwedge \{|\mu(x_n)| \, ; \, n \in \mathbb{N}\} = 0$.

Finally, suppose that $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n$. Notices that, in $2 \Rightarrow 3$, we have shown that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is not only conditionally linear, but also conditionally norm continuous; that is, $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*$.

■

Proposition 11 *We have the following*

$$[\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n = \left[\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\boldsymbol{y}} \, ; \, \boldsymbol{y} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*}\right].$$

Proof.

Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}}$ with $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}$. If $x_n \searrow 0$ a.s., then by monotone convergence, we have that $\mu_y(x_n) = \mathbb{E}[x_n y|\mathcal{F}] \to 0$ a.s. This means that μ_y is σ-order continuous and, due to Proposition 10, we have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n$.

For the reverse inclusion, suppose that $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^{\sim}_n$. Then, in view of Proposition 10, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}} \in [\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*$.

Now, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A_n := (n-1 \leq \|\mu\| < n)$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[1_{A_n}\mu(x)] \leq n\mathbb{E}[\|x|\mathcal{F}\|^A_{\varphi}],$$

and the right hand of the inequality above is finite due to Proposition 2.

Thus, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can define an application

$$\mu_n : L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu_n(x) := \mathbb{E}[1_{A_n}\mu(x)],$$

which is linear. Moreover, by dominated convergence is easy to show that μ_n is σ-order continuous (as μ is σ-order continuous).

From the theory of Orlicz spaces, we have that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $y_n \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$\mu_n(x) := \mathbb{E}[xy_n], \quad \text{for all } x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}).$$

We claim that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$1_{A_n}\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}[y_n x|\mathcal{F}], \quad \text{for all } x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}).$$

Indeed, for fixed $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$ and any $A \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{E}[1_A 1_{A_n}\mu(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\mu_n(1_A x)] = \mathbb{E}[1_A x y_n]$, and this implies the equality above.

Let $y := \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_n} y_n \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$. Then, for $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, we have that $\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}[yx|\mathcal{F}]$.

Finally, since $L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$, we can easily extend the equality to $x \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, obtaining that $\mu = \mu_y$. ■

The following result characterizes those linear applications $\mu : L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ that can be represented by conditional expectations.

Corollary 12 *Let $\mu : L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ be linear. Then, the following are equivalent:*

1. *μ is σ-order continuous and $\mu(1_A x) = 1_A\mu(1_A x)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$;*
2. *there exists $y \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ such that*

$$\mu(x) = \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] \quad \text{for all } x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}).$$

Proof. $2 \Rightarrow 1$ is clear.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$: We define $\bar{\mu} : L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$, where for $x \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, which is of the form $x = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} x_k$ with $\{x_k\} \subset L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, we put $\bar{\mu}(x) = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k}\mu(x_k)$. By using that $\mu(1_A x) = 1_A\mu(1_A x)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we see that $\bar{\mu}$ is well-defined.

Due to Proposition 11, we can pick $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\mu(x) = \bar{\mu}(x) = \mu_y(x)$ for all $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$. ■

5 Application to conditional risk measures of Orlicz spaces

The notion of conditional convex risk measure was independently introduced in [8] and [13]. This definition naturally extends to Orlicz spaces as follows:

Definition 13 *Let $\psi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty]$ be a Young function with $\psi \leq \varphi$. A conditional convex risk measure (of Orlicz spaces) is a function*

$$\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$$

with the following properties for $x, y \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$:

1. *monotonicity: i.e. $x \leq y$ implies $\rho(x) \geq \rho(y)$;*
2. *$L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convexity: i.e. for all $\lambda \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$, with $0 \leq \lambda \leq 1$, $\rho(\lambda x + (1-\lambda)y) \leq \lambda\rho(x) + (1-\lambda)\rho(y)$;*
3. *$L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariance: i.e. for all $\lambda \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$, $\rho(x + \lambda) = \rho(x) - \lambda$.*

Further, given a conditional convex risk measure $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ we define the following version of the Fenchel conjugate

$$\rho^*(y) := \bigvee \{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x)\,;\, x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})\}, \quad \text{for } y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}). \tag{5}$$

Likewise, the notion of dynamic convex risk measure, naturally extends to Orlicz spaces:

Definition 14 *Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{T}}$ be a filtration of $\mathcal{E}$ with $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{N}_0 \cap [0, T]$ and $T \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$, and $\{\varphi_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{T}}$ be a sequence of Young functions with $\varphi \geq \varphi_t \geq \varphi_{t+1}$. A dynamic convex risk measure (of Orlicz spaces) is a sequence $\{\rho_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{T}}$, where $\rho_t : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\varphi_t}(\mathcal{F}_t)$ is a conditional convex risk measure for each $t \in \mathbb{T}$.*

We say that a function $f : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ has the local property if

$$1_A f(1_A x) = \rho(1_A x), \quad \text{for all } A \in \mathcal{F}.$$

Proposition 15 *Let $f : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex function, then f has the local property.*

Proof.

A similar argument is followed in the proof of [16, Theorem 3.2].

Let $A \in \mathcal{F}$. Then, for $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$

$$f(1_A x) = f(1_A x + 1_{A^c} 0) \leq 1_A f(x) + 1_{A^c} f(0) = 1_A f(1_A x + 1_A^c x) + 1_{A^c} f(0) \leq$$

$$\leq 1_A(1_A f(1_A x) + 1_A^c f(x)) + 1_{A^c} f(0) = 1_A f(1_A x) + 1_{A^c} f(0).$$

Finally, by multiplying by 1_A, the inequalities above become equalities and

$$1_A f(1_A x) = 1_A f(x).$$

■

Proposition 16 *Let $f : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a function with the local property, then there is a unique stable extension*

$$\bar{f} : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F}).$$

Moreover, if f is monotone, then $\bar{f}$ is monotone; if f is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex, then $\bar{f}$ is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex; and if f is $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant, then $\bar{f}$ is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant (i.e. $\bar{f}(x+\lambda) = \bar{f}(x) - \lambda$ for $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\lambda \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$).

Further, for all $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$:

$$\bigvee \{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - f(x)\,;\, x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})\} = \bigvee \left\{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{f}(x)\,;\, x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})\right\}, \quad (6)$$

i.e. the version of the Fenchel conjugate f^* introduced in (5) agrees on $L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with the modular version of the Fenchel conjugate $\bar{f}^*$ (see [16]).

Proof.

Suppose that $f : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ has the local property. Due to Proposition 1, we have that $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$. Then, given $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ of the form $x = \sum 1_{A_k} x_k$ with $\{x_k\} \subset L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, let

$$\bar{f}(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} 1_{A_k} f(x_k).$$

By using the local property of f, it is not difficult to show that $\bar{f}$ is well-defined, is stable, and is not possible another stable extension.

If f is monotone, it is clear that $\bar{f}$ is monotone too. Also it is clear that the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convexity of f implies the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convexity of $\bar{f}$.

By using that $\overline{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})}^{cc} = L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is easy to show that, if f is $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant, then $\bar{f}$ is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant.

Finally, for a given $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, by using that $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$ and that the application $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{f}(x)$ is stable, we obtain (6) by means of Lemma 9. ■

Remark 17 *Notice that, given a conditional convex risk measure ρ, since $\bar{\rho}$ and $\bar{\rho}^*$ are stable, we can define conditional functions*

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}} : \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi} \to \boldsymbol{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^* : \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*} \to \boldsymbol{R}.$$

In particular, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ is conditionally monotone, conditionally convex and conditionally cash-invariant (i.e. $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\boldsymbol{x}+\boldsymbol{r}) = \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \boldsymbol{r}$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}$ and $\boldsymbol{r} \in \boldsymbol{R}$). Also, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*$ is precisely the conditional Fenchel conjugate of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$, i.e.

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*(\boldsymbol{y}) := \boldsymbol{sup}\left[\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{xy}|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\boldsymbol{x})\,;\, \boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi}\right].$$

The following result shows that, if we replace $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convexity and $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariance by convexity, cash-invariance (considering only real numbers) and the local property in Definition 13, then we obtain an equivalent definition of conditional convex risk measure.

Proposition 18 *Let $f : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a monotone function. The following properties are equivalent:*

1. *f is convex and has the local property;*
2. *f is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex.*

In this case, if in addition f is cash-invariant, then f is also $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant.

Proof. $2 \Rightarrow 1$: It is obvious that f is convex. The local property is given by Proposition 15.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$: Since f has the local property, in virtue of Proposition 16, it can be extended to a function $\bar{f} : L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$. By Proposition 4, we know that $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ is conditionally norm continuous and conditionally convex. Consequently, $\bar{f}$ is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex; hence, f is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-convex. Suppose now that f is cash-invariant, and let us show that it is also $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariant. Indeed, given $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $a \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F})$, let us consider a countable and dense subset H of $\mathbb{R}$. Suppose $H = \{h_1, h_2, ...\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $B_1 := (a \leq h_1 < a + 1/n)$ and $B_k := (a \leq h_k < a + 1/n) - \bigvee_{i=1}^{k-1} B_i$ for $k > 1$. Define $a_n := \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} h_k 1_{B_k}$. By doing so, we obtain a conditional sequence $\{\mathbf{a_n}\}_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}}$. Then, by using again that $\bar{\mathbf{f}}$ is conditionally continuous, together with the fact that f is cash-invariant and stable, we have that

$$\bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a}) = \lim_{\mathbf{n}} \bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{a_n}) = \bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) - \lim_{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{a_n} = \bar{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{a}.$$

We conclude that $f(x + a) = \bar{f}(x + a) = \bar{f}(x) - a = f(x) - a$. ■

In what follows we will study the representation of a conditional convex risk measure $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$. We have the following result:

Theorem 19 *Let $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a conditional convex risk measure, then the following properties are equivalent:*

1. *$\bar{\rho}$ is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous;*
2. *For every $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$*

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0 \right\};$$

3. *For every $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$*

$$\rho(x) = \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y) \,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0 \right\}.$$

Proof. $2 \Rightarrow 1$ is clear.

$2 \Leftrightarrow 3$: Since $L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) = \overline{L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})}^{cc}$, we have that

$$\left\{ y \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, y \leq 0,\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1 \right\} = \overline{\left\{ y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, y \leq 0,\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1 \right\}}^{cc}.$$

Besides, since the map $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y)$ is stable and (according to Proposition 16) $\rho^*(y) = \bar{\rho}^*(y)$ for $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, due to Lemma 9 we obtain that for any $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0 \right\} = \\ &= \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y) \,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Then, $2 \Rightarrow 3$ is clear from (7).

As for $3 \Rightarrow 2$, we see that the map

$$x \mapsto \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0 \right\},$$

is stable and, due to (7), agrees with ρ on $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$. Then, due to Proposition 16, we obtain the result.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$: It is easy to show that $\langle L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) \rangle$ is a random dual pair in the sense of [24]. Therefore, due to [24, Theorem 3.22], we have $\left(L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), \sigma(L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})) \right)^* = L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$[9]. By using the modular version of the classical Fenchel-Moreau dual representation theorem [16, Theorem 3.8] we obtain

$$\bar{\rho}(x) := \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) \right\}, \quad \text{for } x \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Let us show that $\mathrm{dom}(\bar{\rho}^*) \subset \left\{ y \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, y \leq 0,\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1 \right\}$. Indeed, let $z \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, then for a given $\lambda \in L_{++}^0(\mathcal{F})$, due to the monotonicity of $\bar{\rho}$, we have

$$\bar{\rho}^*(z) \geq \mathbb{E}[\lambda 1_{(z \geq 0)} z|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}(\lambda 1_{(z \geq 0)}) \geq \lambda \mathbb{E}[z^+|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}(0).$$

Since λ is arbitrary, we have that the left side of the inequality above is finite only if $z \leq 0$.

Further, due to the $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-cash invariance of $\bar{\rho}$, for any $\lambda \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$ we have the following

$$\bar{\rho}^*(z) \geq \mathbb{E}[\lambda z|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}(\lambda) = \lambda \left(\mathbb{E}[z|\mathcal{F}] + 1 \right) - \bar{\rho}(0),$$

being λ arbitrary, the left hand of the inequality above is finite only if $\mathbb{E}[z|\mathcal{F}] = -1$.

■

Regarding the attainability of the representation provided above, we have the following result:

Theorem 20 *Let $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a conditional convex risk measure, such that $\bar{\rho}$ is $\sigma(L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous, then the following are equivalent:*

[9] Notice that '$*$' denotes here the modular topological conjugate, instead of the conditional topological dual. As commented in the section of preliminaries, this topology can possibly be non-stable.

1. *ρ has the Lebesgue property, i.e*

$$y \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), |x_n| \leq |y| \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, x_n \to x \text{ a.s. implies } \rho(x_n) \to \rho(x) \text{ a.s.};$$

2. *$\bar{\rho}$ has the Lebesgue property, i.e*

$$y \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), |x_n| \leq |y| \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{N}, x_n \to x \text{ a.s. implies } \bar{\rho}(x_n) \to \bar{\rho}(x) \text{ a.s.};$$

3. *For every $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ there exists $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with $y \leq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ such that*

$$\rho(x) = \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y);$$

4. *For every $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ there exists $y \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ with $y \leq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ such that*

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y);$$

5. *For each $\boldsymbol{c} \in \boldsymbol{R}^{++}$,*

$$\boldsymbol{V_c} := \left[\boldsymbol{y} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*} \,;\, \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*(\boldsymbol{y}) \leq \boldsymbol{c}\right] \quad \text{is conditionally } \sigma(\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*}, \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi})\text{-compact;}$$

6. *For each $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $c > 0$,*

$$\boldsymbol{V_c} := \left[\boldsymbol{y} \in \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*} \,;\, \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*(\boldsymbol{y}) \leq \boldsymbol{c}\right] \quad \text{is conditionally } \sigma(\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*}, \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi})\text{-compact.}$$

Before proving the statement above, we need some preliminary results.

In particular, we have the following lemma of scalarization of conditional risk measures:

Lemma 21 *Let $\rho : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^{\psi}(\mathcal{F})$ be a conditional convex risk measure. Then the function*

$$\rho_0 : L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}) \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \rho_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)],$$

is a (static) convex risk measure.

Moreover, suppose that

$$\rho_0^*(y) = \sup\left\{\mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0(x) \,;\, x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})\right\}, \quad \text{for } y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$$

is the Fenchel conjugate of ρ_0, then $\rho_0^*(y) = \mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)]$ for all $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$.

In addition, if $\bar{\rho}$ is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous, then ρ_0 is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous.

Proof.

Inspection shows that ρ_0 is a convex risk measure. Let us show that $\rho_0^*(y) = \mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)]$. Indeed, for a given $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, the set $M_y := \{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x) \,;\, x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})\}$ is upward directed, because the function $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x)$ has the local property.

Therefore, there exists a sequence $\{x_n\} \subset L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, so that $\mathbb{E}[x_n y|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x_n) \nearrow \bigvee M_y = \rho_0^*(y)$.

By monotone convergence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)] = \mathbb{E}[\lim_n (\mathbb{E}[x_n y|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x_n))] = \lim_n (\mathbb{E}[x_n y] - \rho_0(x_n)) \leq \rho_0^*(y).$$

Also, for every $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho(x)] = \mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0(x),$$

hence $\mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)] \geq \sup\{\mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0(x)\,;\, x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})\} = \rho_0^*(y)$. We conclude that $\rho_0^*(y) = \mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y)]$.

Finally, let us suppose that $\bar{\rho}$ is $\sigma(L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous. By Theorem 19, we have that

$$\rho(x) = \bigvee \left\{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)\,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0\right\} \quad \text{for all } x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}).$$

Now, for a fixed $x \in L^\varphi(\mathcal{E})$, we have that the set

$$M_x := \left\{\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)\,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1,\, y \leq 0\right\}$$

is upward directed (the function $y \mapsto \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)$ has the local property). Thus, we can find a sequence $\{y_n\} \subset L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\mathbb{E}[y_n|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ and $y_n \leq 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[xy_n|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y_n) \nearrow \bigvee M_x = \rho(x)$.

By monotone convergence, and by using that $\mathbb{E}[\rho^*(y_n)] = \rho_0^*(y_n)$, we have

$$\rho_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\lim_n (\mathbb{E}[xy_n|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y_n))] = \lim_n (\mathbb{E}[xy_n] - \rho_0^*(y_n)).$$

Also, for every $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, we have

$$\rho_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)] = \mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0^*(y),$$

hence $\rho_0(x) \geq \sup\{\mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0^*(y)\,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})\}$.

We conclude that

$$\rho_0(x) = \sup\{\mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0^*(y)\,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})\}.$$

This implies that ρ_0 is $\sigma(L^\varphi(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous. ■

A similar result can be found in [27, Lemma 2].

Lemma 22 *Let $\{y_n\}$ be a sequence in $L^0(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\limsup y_n = y$. Then, there exists a sequence $n_1 < n_2 < \ldots$ in $L^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{N})$, such that $\{y_{n_k}\}$ converges a.s. to y.*

Notice that if C is a subset of $L^0(\mathcal{E})$ with the countable concatenation property, then the solid hull

$$\mathrm{sol}(C) := \left\{x \in L^0(\mathcal{E})\,;\, \text{there exists } y \in C,\, |x| \leq |y|\right\},$$

also has the countable concatenation property. Then it generates a conditional set which is denoted by $\mathbf{sol}(\mathbf{C})$, and will be referred to as *conditional solid hull* of $\mathbf{C}$.

The following lemma provides a test for conditional $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-compactness.

Lemma 23 *Let $C \subset L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with the countable concatenation property. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. $\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|u_n z||\mathcal{F}] \to 0$ *a.s. whenever* $u_n \searrow 0$ *a.s. in* $L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$*;*

2. $\boldsymbol{sol}(\boldsymbol{C})$ *is conditionally* $\sigma(\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*}, \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi})$*-relatively compact.*

Then, in this case, $\boldsymbol{C}$ *is conditionally* $\sigma(\boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi^*}, \boldsymbol{L}^{\varphi})$*-relatively compact.*

Proof. $1 \Rightarrow 2$: Put $\mathbf{K} := \mathbf{sol}(\mathbf{C})$. First, we will prove that $\overline{\mathbf{K}}^{\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*},\mathbf{L}^{\varphi})} = \overline{\mathbf{K}}^{\sigma([\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*,\mathbf{L}^{\varphi})}$. For that, it suffices to show that $\overline{K}^{\sigma([\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*,\mathbf{L}^{\varphi})}$ actually lies on $\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}$, i.e. every $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \overline{K}^{\sigma([\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*,\mathbf{L}^{\varphi})}$ satisfies that μ is σ-order continuous.

Indeed, for a given $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \overline{K}^{\sigma([\mathbf{L}^{\varphi}]^*,\mathbf{L}^{\varphi})}$ and $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}^{++}$, let us fix $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$. Then, there is $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $|(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{y}} - \boldsymbol{\mu})(\mathbf{u})| \leq \mathbf{r}$. Since $\mathbf{K} := \mathbf{sol}(\mathbf{C})$, we can find $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{C}$ so that $|\mathbf{y}| \leq |\mathbf{z}|$. Thus,

$$|\mu(u)| \leq |(\mu - \mu_y)(u)| + |\mu_y(u)| \leq r + \bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|uz||\mathcal{F}].$$

Since r is arbitrary, we have that

$$|\mu(u)| \leq \bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|uz||\mathcal{F}], \quad \text{for all } u \in L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Now, let $\{u_n\}$ be a decreasing sequence in $L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\bigwedge u_n = 0$. Then, the inequality above implies that $\bigwedge |\mu(u_n)| = 0$. Also, it is not difficult to show that every $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-linear continuous function is also order bounded. This means that $\mu : L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{F}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ is σ-order continuous.

The second step is to prove that $\mathbf{K}$ is conditionally norm bounded (or equivalently $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm bounded). Indeed, given $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi}$, we have that $\frac{1}{n}|x| \searrow 0$ a.s. Then, by hypothesis, $\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{n}|xz||\mathcal{F}] \to 0$ a.s. In particular, since $\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{n}|xz||\mathcal{F}] = \frac{1}{n} \bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}]$, necessarily $\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}]$ is finite. Moreover, inspection shows that $\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}] = \bigvee_{z\in K} \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}]$. This means that there exists $\mathbf{r_x} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{zx}|\mathcal{F}]| \leq \mathbf{r_x} \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{K}.$$

By the conditional version of the Uniform Boundedness Principle [39, Theorem 3.4], we obtain that $\mathbf{K}$ is conditionally norm bounded.

Finally, the conditional Banach-Alaoglu Theorem ([14, Theorem 5.10]) yields the result.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$: Now, let $u_n \searrow 0$ a.s. in $L_{\mathcal{F}}^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$. For fixed $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}^{++}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we can find $z_n \in C$ such that

$$\bigvee_{z\in C} \mathbb{E}[|u_n z||\mathcal{F}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|u_n z_n||\mathcal{F}] + r.$$

Then, we can consider the conditional sequence $\{|\mathbf{z_n}|\}$ in $\mathbf{K} := \mathbf{sol}(\mathbf{C})$. Since $\mathbf{K}$ is conditionally relatively compact, due to Remark 3.20 and Proposition 3.25 of [14], we can find some conditional $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-cluster point $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}$ of $\{|\mathbf{z_n}|\}$. Besides, we have that $\mathbf{z} \geq \mathbf{0}$[10].

Also, we can find $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\mathbf{0} \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}\mathbf{u}_\mathbf{n}|\mathcal{F}] \leq \mathbf{r}$ for all $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{n}_1$. Let us pick $\mathbf{n}_2 \geq \mathbf{n}_1$ such that $|\mathbb{E}[(|\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}_2}| - \mathbf{z})\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_1}|\mathcal{F}]| \leq \mathbf{r}$. Then, for $\mathbf{n} \geq \mathbf{n}_2$, we have

$$\mathop{\mathbf{sup}}_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbf{C}}\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{u_n z}||\mathcal{F}] \leq \mathop{\mathbf{sup}}_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbf{C}}\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_2}|\mathbf{z}||\mathcal{F}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_2}|\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}_2}||\mathcal{F}] + \mathbf{r} \leq$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_1}|\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}_2}||\mathcal{F}] + \mathbf{r} = \mathbb{E}[(|\mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{n}_2}| - \mathbf{z})\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_1}|\mathcal{F}] + \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{n}_1}|\mathcal{F}] + \mathbf{r} \leq \mathbf{3r}.$$

This yields that $\mathbf{lim_n} \mathop{\mathbf{sup}}_{\mathbf{z}\in\mathbf{C}}\mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{u_n z}||\mathcal{F}] = \mathbf{0}$. It is not difficult to show that this implies that $\bigvee_{z\in C}\mathbb{E}[|u_n z||\mathcal{F}] \to 0$ a.s. (considering now $n \in \mathbb{N}$). ■

The following result is an adaptation to the present setting of [33, Lemma 2.3].

Lemma 24 *Suppose that $\bar{\rho}$ is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous and $\bar{\rho}(0) = 0$, then for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ and $y \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$*

$$\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \geq -\beta \quad \text{implies} \quad \bar{\rho}^*(y) \leq 2\beta + 2\bar{\rho}(-2|x|).$$

Proof.

Due to Theorem 19, since $\bar{\rho}$ is lower semicontinuous, we have

$$0 = \bar{\rho}(0) = \bigvee \left\{ -\bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}),\, y \leq 0,\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1 \right\} =$$

$$= -\bigwedge \left\{ \bar{\rho}^*(y) \,;\, y \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}),\, y \leq 0,\, \mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1 \right\}.$$

Then, given $\varepsilon \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$, there exists $y_\varepsilon \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$ with $y_\varepsilon \leq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[y_\varepsilon|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ such that $0 \leq \bar{\rho}^*(y_\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$.

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[-2|x|\frac{y + y_\varepsilon}{2}|\mathcal{F}\right] \leq \bar{\rho}(-2|x|) + \bar{\rho}^*\left(\frac{y + y_\varepsilon}{2}\right) \leq$$

$$\leq \bar{\rho}(-2|x|) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}^*(y) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}^*(y_\varepsilon) = \bar{\rho}(-2|x|) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}^*(y) + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε is arbitrary, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] \leq \bar{\rho}(-2|x|) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}^*(y).$$

Then, if $\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\rho}^*(y) \geq -\beta$, we have that

$$\bar{\rho}^*(y) \leq \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] + \beta \leq \bar{\rho}(-2|x|) + \frac{1}{2}\bar{\rho}^*(y) + \beta.$$

[10] Indeed, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we can find $n_k \in L^0(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{F})$ such that $|\mathbb{E}[(|z_{n_k}| - z)1_{(z\leq 0)}|\mathcal{F}]| \leq \frac{1}{k}$, this means that $\mathbb{E}[|z_{n_k}|1_{(z\leq 0)}|\mathcal{F}] \to \mathbb{E}[z^-|\mathcal{F}]$ a.s. This implies that $\mathbb{E}[z^-|\mathcal{F}] \geq 0$, and therefore $z \geq 0$.

From where we finally obtain

$$\bar{\rho}^*(y) \leq 2\beta + 2\bar{\rho}(-2|x|).$$

■

Proof of Theorem 20.

$1 \Rightarrow 3$: For a given $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, let us define $\rho_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)]$ as in Lemma 21, which is a convex risk measure.

Since $\rho(x) \geq \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)$ for all $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\mathbb{E}[y|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ and $y \leq 0$, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y)],$$

or equivalently that

$$\rho_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0^*(y).$$

Since ρ_0 is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous, by [33, Theorem 1.1] it suffices to prove that ρ_0 has the Lebesgue property. Indeed, suppose that $\{x_n\}$ satisfies $|x_n| \leq |y|$ for some $y \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $x_n \to x$ a.s. Since ρ has the Lebesgue property, it holds that $\rho(x_n)$ converges to $\rho(x)$ a.s. Also, by monotonicity, we have that $|\rho(x_n)| \leq |\rho(y)| \vee |\rho(-y)|$. Then, by dominated convergence we have that

$$\lim_n \rho_0(x_n) = \mathbb{E}[\lim_n \rho(x_n)] = \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)] = \rho_0(x).$$

$3 \Rightarrow 1$: Suppose that $\{x_n\}$ satisfies $|x_n| \leq |y|$ for some $y \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $x_n \to x$ a.s. Then, by dominated convergence we have $\lim_n \mathbb{E}[x_n z|\mathcal{F}] = \mathbb{E}[xz|\mathcal{F}]$ for all $z \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\mathbb{E}[z|\mathcal{F}] = -1$ and $z \leq 0$.

Then

$$\rho(x) = \bigvee \left\{ \lim_n \mathbb{E}[x_n z|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(z) \, ; \, z \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}), \, \mathbb{E}[z|\mathcal{F}] = -1, \, z \leq 0 \right\} \leq$$

$$\leq \liminf_n \bigvee \left\{ E[x_n z|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(z) \, ; \, z \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}), \, \mathbb{E}[z|\mathcal{F}] = -1, \, z \leq 0 \right\} =$$

$$= \liminf_n \rho(x_n).$$

It suffices to show that $\rho(x) \geq \limsup_n \rho(x_n)$. Indeed, suppose that $\rho(x) < \limsup_n \rho(x_n)$ on some $A \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$. We can suppose $A = \Omega$ w.l.g.

Again, we consider the convex risk measure $\rho_0(x) := \mathbb{E}[\rho(x)]$, for which we have

$$\rho_0(x) < \mathbb{E}[\limsup \rho(x_n)].$$

By using Lemma 22, we can construct a sequence $\{z_n\}$, with $|z_n| \leq |y|$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $z_n \to x$ a.s. and $\rho(z_n) \to \limsup_n \rho(x_n)$.

Then, by dominated convergence

$$\lim_n \rho_0(z_n) = \mathbb{E}[\lim_n \rho(z_n)] = \mathbb{E}[\limsup_n \rho(x_n)] > \rho_0(x).$$

However, by assumption, for each $z \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, we have

$$\rho_0(z) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[zy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(z)] = \mathbb{E}[zy] - \rho_0^*(y),$$

for some $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ and also ρ_0 is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous. Thus, by [33, Theorem 1.1], we have that ρ_0 has necessarily the Lebesgue property; hence, $\lim_n \rho_0(z_n) = \rho_0(x)$. This is a contradiction.

$3 \Rightarrow 4$: Given $x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, we know that there are $\{x_k\} \subset L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that $x = \sum 1_{A_k} x_k$. Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $y_k \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ such that

$$\rho(x_k) = \mathbb{E}[x_k y_k|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y_k), \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $y = \sum 1_{A_k} y_k$. Then, since $\bar{\rho}$ is stable and $\rho^*(y) = \bar{\rho}^*(y)$ for $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$, we have

$$\bar{\rho}(x) = \sum 1_{A_k} \rho(x_k) = \sum 1_{A_k} \left(\mathbb{E}[x_k y_k|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y_k)\right) = \mathbb{E}[xy|\mathcal{F}] - \rho^*(y).$$

$4 \Rightarrow 3$: It is clear, as $\rho^*(y) = \bar{\rho}^*(y)$ for $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ (see last part of Proposition 16).

$2 \Rightarrow 1$ is clear.

$1 \Rightarrow 2$: Let $y \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, $|x_n| \leq y$ such that $x_n \to x$ a.s. Let us take $\{y_k\} \subset L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such the $y = \sum 1_{A_k} y_k$.

Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $|1_{A_k} x_n| \leq 1_{A_k} y_k$ and $x_n \to x$ a.s. Thus, $\rho(1_{A_k} x_n) \to \rho(1_{A_k} x)$ a.s. Then, $\bar{\rho}(x_n) = \sum 1_{A_k} \rho(1_{A_k} x_n)$ converges a.s. to $\sum 1_{A_k} \rho(1_{A_k} x) = \bar{\rho}(x)$.

$1 \Rightarrow 5$: We have already shown (see $1 \Rightarrow 3$) that, under this assumption, ρ_0 is $\sigma(L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}))$-lower semicontinuous and, for any $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, there exists $y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ such that $\rho_0(x) = \mathbb{E}[xy] - \rho_0(y)$. Then, by [33, Theorem 1.1], we obtain that, for any positive $c \in \mathbb{R}$, the set

$$V_c^0 := \left\{ y \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}) \,;\, \rho^*(y) \leq c \right\} \quad \text{is } \sigma(L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}))\text{-compact.}$$

Let us define

$$f_c(x) := \bigvee \left\{ \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}] \,;\, z \in L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}),\, \bar{\rho}^*(z) \leq c \right\}, \quad \text{for } x \in L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E});$$

$$f_{0,c}(x) := \sup \left\{ \mathbb{E}[|xz|] \,;\, z \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \rho_0^*(z) \leq c \right\}, \quad \text{for } x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}).$$

Given $x \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$, the set $H_x := \left\{ \mathbb{E}[|xz||\mathcal{F}] \,;\, z \in L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}),\, \bar{\rho}^*(z) \leq c \right\}$ is upward directed; hence, one can find a sequence $\{z_n\} \subset L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E})$ with $\bar{\rho}^*(z_n) \leq c$ such that $\mathbb{E}[|xz_n||\mathcal{F}] \nearrow \bigvee H_x$. Besides, due to Lemma 9, we have $\bigvee H_x = f_c(x)$.

Since $c \geq \mathbb{E}[\bar{\rho}^*(z_n)] = \rho_0^*(z_n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, by dominated convergence we have that $\mathbb{E}[f_c(x)] = \mathbb{E}[\lim \mathbb{E}[|xz_n||\mathcal{F}]] = \lim \mathbb{E}[|xz_n|] \leq f_{0,c}(x)$.

Now, let $x_n \searrow 0$ a.s. in $L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$. First note that, since $\overline{L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})}^{cc} = L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E})$, there is a partition $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, such that $1_{A_k} x_1 \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ is solid and $0 \leq x_n \leq x_1$, we have that $1_{A_k} x_n \in L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$ for all

$k, n \in \mathbb{N}$. By arguing on each A_k, we can suppose that $A_k = \Omega$, and thus $\{x_n\} \subset L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E})$.

Since $C := V_{0,c}$ is $\sigma(L^{\varphi^*}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi}(\mathcal{E}))$-compact, due to [33, Lemma 2.1], we obtain that $f_{0,c}(x_n) \to 0$ a.s. Therefore, we obtain

$$0 \leq \lim_n \mathbb{E}[f_c(x_n)] \leq \lim_n f_{0,c}(x_n) = 0.$$

Since $f_c(x_n) \geq f_c(x_{n+1}) > 0$, necessarily $f_c(x_n) \to 0$ a.s. (This happens on each A_k; therefore, on Ω).

Due to Lemma 23, we conclude that $\mathbf{V_c}$ is conditionally relatively $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-compact. Besides, since $\bar{\rho}$ is lower semicontinuous, we have that V_c is $\sigma(L^{\varphi^*}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}), L^{\varphi}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{E}))$-closed. Since V_c has the countable concatenation property, by the comments in section of preliminaries about the weak topologies, we have that $\mathbf{V_c}$ is conditionally closed; in turn, we also obtain the conditional compactness.

$5 \Rightarrow 6$: For arbitrary $c \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$, we can find $r \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}^{cc}$ such that $c \leq r$. Suppose that $r = \sum 1_{A_k} r_k$ with $\{A_k\} \in \Pi(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and $\{r_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have that $\mathbf{V}_{r_k}|A_k$ is conditionally compact. We derive that $\mathbf{V_c} \sqsubset \mathbf{V_r} = \sum \mathbf{V}_{r_k}|A_k$ is conditionally compact too.

$6 \Rightarrow 4$: We can suppose w.l.g. that $\rho(0) = 0$. Due to the conditionally lower semicontinuity of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*$, the conditional function $\mathbf{z} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{xz}|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*(\mathbf{z})$ is conditionally $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-upper semicontinuous. Then, the conditional set

$$\mathbf{M_x} := [\mathbf{z} \in \mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*} \,;\, \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{xz}|\mathcal{F}] - \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}^*(\mathbf{z}) \geq \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{1}]$$

is conditionally $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-closed and, applying Lemma 24 for $\beta = 1 - \bar{\rho}(x)$, we obtain that $\mathbf{M_x}$ is conditionally contained in $\mathbf{V_{2-2\bar{\rho}(x)+2\bar{\rho}(-2|x|)}}$. Therefore, $\mathbf{M_x}$ is conditionally $\sigma(\mathbf{L}^{\varphi^*}, \mathbf{L}^{\varphi})$-compact.

Finally, it is not difficult to show that every conditionally upper semicontinuous function attains its conditional maximum on a conditionally compact set (for the sake of completeness we have included the proof in the appendix, see Proposition 26), obtaining the result.

■

References

[1] B. Acciaio, and I. Penner. Dynamic risk measures. Advanced Mathematical Methods for Finance. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011. 1-34.

[2] C. D. Aliprantis and K.C. Border: Infinite Dimensional Analysis. A Hitchhiker's Guide, third ed., Springer, 2006.

[3] C. D. Aliprantis, and O. Burkinshaw: Locally solid Riesz spaces with applications to economics. No. 105. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.

[4] P. Artzner, F. Delbaen, J.-M. Eber, and D. Heath: Coherent measures of risk. Math. Finance, 9(3):203–228, 1999.

[5] P. Artzner, F. Delbaen, J.-M. Eber, David Heath, and Hyejin Ku. Coherent multiperiod risk adjusted values and Bellman's principle. Ann. Oper. Res., 152:5–22, 2007.

[6] J. L. Bell. Set theory: Boolean-valued models and independence proofs. Oxford Logic Guides. Clarendon Press, 2005.

[7] S. Biagini, and M. Frittelli. A unified framework for utility maximization problems: an Orlicz space approach. The Annals of Applied Probability 18.3 (2008): 929-966.

[8] J. Bion-Nadal: Conditional risk measures and robust representation of convex conditional risk measures. Preprint, 2004.

[9] P. Cheridito and T. Li: Dual characterization of properties of risk measures on Orlicz hearts. Math. Financ. Econ., 2(1):29–55, 2008.

[10] P. J. Cohen: The independence of the continuum hypothesis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 50:1143–1148, 1963

[11] F. Delbaen. Coherent risk measures. Cattedra Galileiana. [Galileo Chair]. Scuola Normale Superiore, Classe di Scienze, Pisa, 2000.

[12] F. Delbaen, and K. Owari. On convex functions on the duals of Δ_2-Orlicz spaces. arXiv preprint:1611.06218 (2016).

[13] K. Detlefsen, and G. Scandolo: Conditional dynamic convex risk measures. Finance Stoch. 9(4), 539–561 (2005).

[14] S. Drapeau, A. Jamneshan, M. Karliczek, and M. Kupper: The algebra of conditional sets, and the concepts of conditional topology and compactness. J. Math. Anal. Appl., 437 (1) (2016), 561–589.

[15] S. Drapeau, A. Jamneshan, and M. Kupper: Vector duality via conditional extension of dual pairs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.08709 (2016).

[16] D. Filipović, M. Kupper, and N. Vogelpoth: Separation and duality in locally L^0-convex modules. Journal of Functional Analysis 256.12 (2009): 3996-4029.

[17] D. Filipović, M. Kupper, and N. Vogelpoth: Approaches to conditional risk. SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics 3.1 (2012): 402-432.

[18] H. Föllmer and A. Schied. Convex measures of risk and trading constraints. Finance Stoch., 6(4):429–447, 2002.

[19] H. Föllmer and Alexander Schied: Stochastic finance, volume 27 of de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, extended edition, 2004. An introduction in discrete time

[20] Hans Föllmer and Irina Penner: Convex risk measures and the dynamics of their penalty functions. Statist. Decisions, 24(1):61–96, 2006.

[21] M. Frittelli: No arbitrage and Preferences. Instituto Lombardo—Accademia di Scienze e Lettere (2007): 179-199.

[22] M. Frittelli and E. R. Gianin. Putting order in risk measures. Journal of Banking and Finance, 26(7):1473–1486, 2002.

[23] T. Guo: Relations between some basic results derived from two kinds of topologies for a random locally convex module, J. Funct. Anal. 258 (2010) 3024-3047.

[24] T. Guo, S. Zhao, and X. Zeng: On random convex analysis – the analytic foundation of the module approach to conditional risk measures, arXiv preprint:1210.1848 (2012).

[25] T. Guo, S. Zhao, and X. Zeng: The relations among the three kinds of conditional risk measures. Science China Mathematics 57.8 (2014): 1753-1764.

[26] T. Thomas: Set theory. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.

[27] Y. Kabanov, Ch. Stricker, A teacher's note on no-arbitrage criteria, Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg 35 (2001) 149–152.

[28] W. A. Luxemburg: Banach Function Spaces, Delft, 1955.

[29] M. Nowak: Order continuous linear functionals on non-locally convex Orlicz spaces. Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 33 (1992): 465-475.

[30] T.M. Offwood: No free lunch and risk measures on Orlicz spaces, Diss. University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa, 2012.

[31] J. Orihuela, M. Ruíz Galán, Lebesgue property for convex risk measures on Orlicz spaces, Math. Financ. Econ. 6(1) (2012) 15-35.

[32] J. Orihuela, and J. M. Zapata: On conditional Lebesgue property for conditional risk measures. arXiv preprint:1509.07081 (2015).

[33] K. Owari: On the Lebesgue property of monotone convex functions. Mathematics and Financial Economics 8.2 (2014): 159-167.

[34] K. Owari: Maximum Lebesgue extension of monotone convex functions. Journal of Functional Analysis 266.6 (2014): 3572-3611.

[35] M. M. Rao, and Z. D. Ren: Theory of Orlicz spaces. 1991.

[36] N. Vogelpoth: L^0-convex Analysis and Conditional Risk Measures. PhD thesis, Universität Wien, 2009.

[37] A.C. Zaanen: Riesz spaces II, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1983.

[38] J. M. Zapata: On the characterization of locally L^0-convex topologies induced by a family of L^0-seminorms, J. Convex Anal. 24(2) (2017) - to appear.

[39] J. M. Zapata: Versions of Eberlein-Šmulian and Amir-Lindenstrauss theorems in the framework of conditional sets. Applicable Analysis and Discrete Mathematics 10(2) (2016): 231–261.

A Appendix

Proposition 25 *The Amemiya formula defines a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norm such that*

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi \leq \|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A \leq 2\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi. \tag{8}$$

Proof. Let us first show the inequality (8).

For given $\lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$ with $\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right] \leq 1$, we have that

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A \leq \lambda\left(1+\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) \leq 2\lambda.$$

Then, by taking infimums in λ we obtain

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A \leq 2\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi.$$

On the other hand, let us fix $\lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$ and let us take

$$\hat{\lambda} := \lambda\left(1+\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right).$$

If so, using the convexity of φ, we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\hat{\lambda}}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{\frac{|x|}{\lambda}}{1+\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\lambda}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\lambda}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]}{1+\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|x|}{\lambda}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]} \leq 1$$

We derive that

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi \leq \hat{\lambda}$$

and by taking infimums in λ, we conclude

$$\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi \leq \|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A.$$

Finally, let us show that $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A$ is a $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-norms. In view of the inequality (8), it suffices to show that $\|\cdot|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A : L^\varphi_\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E}) \to L^0(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies the triangle inequality and is $L^0(\mathcal{F})$-homogeneous.

Given $x_1, x_2 \in L^\varphi_\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{E})$ and $\varepsilon \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$, for some $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$ we have

$$\lambda_i\left(1+\mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x_i|{\lambda_i}^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) \leq \|x_i|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for } i=1,2.$$

Let $\lambda := \frac{\lambda_1\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}$. By the convexity of φ, we have

$$\|x_1 + x_2|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A \leq \lambda \left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x_1 + x_2|\lambda^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) =$$

$$= \frac{\lambda_1\lambda_2}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\left|\frac{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}{\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}^{-1}x_1 + \frac{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}^{-1}x_2\right|\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) \leq$$

$$\leq \lambda_1\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x_1|{\lambda_1}^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) + \lambda_2\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x_2|{\lambda_2}^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right) \leq \|x_1|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A + \|x_2|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A + \varepsilon.$$

Since $\varepsilon \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})$ is arbitrary, we obtain the triangle inequality.

Finally, let $\mu \in L^0(\mathcal{F})$. Then,

$$\|\mu x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A = \bigwedge\left\{\lambda\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(\frac{|\mu x|}{\lambda}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right)\ ;\ \lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\right\} =$$

$$= |\mu|\bigwedge\left\{\frac{\lambda}{|\mu|}\left(1 + \mathbb{E}\left[\varphi\left(|x|\left(\frac{\lambda}{|\mu|}\right)^{-1}\right)|\mathcal{F}\right]\right)\ ;\ \lambda \in L^0_{++}(\mathcal{F})\right\} = |\mu|\|x|\mathcal{F}\|_\varphi^A$$

■

Proposition 26 *Suppose that $(\boldsymbol{E}, \mathcal{T})$ is a conditional topological space, $\boldsymbol{f}\colon \boldsymbol{E} \to \overline{\boldsymbol{R}}$ is a conditionally upper semicontinuous function, and $\boldsymbol{K}$ is a conditionally compact subset of $\boldsymbol{E}$. If $\operatorname*{\boldsymbol{supf}}_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\boldsymbol{K}}(\boldsymbol{y}) \in \boldsymbol{R}$, then there exists $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{K}$ such that $\boldsymbol{f}(\boldsymbol{x}) := \operatorname*{\boldsymbol{supf}}_{\boldsymbol{y}\in\boldsymbol{K}}(\boldsymbol{y})$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{r} := \operatorname*{\mathbf{supf}}_{\mathbf{y}\in\mathbf{K}}(\mathbf{y})$. For each $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{K}$, we define

$$\mathbf{C_n} := \left[\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}\ ;\ \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \mathbf{r} - \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{n}}\right].$$

Clearly $\mathbf{C_n}$ is on 1. Besides, since $\mathbf{f}$ is conditionally upper semicontinuous, we obtain that $\mathbf{C_n}$ is conditionally closed in $\mathbf{K}$. Also, for every $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{N}$, we have that $\sqcap_{\mathbf{n}\leq\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{C_n} = \mathbf{C_m}$.

Due to [14, Proposition 3.25], we have that $\sqcap_{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{N}}\mathbf{C_n}$ is on 1. Thus, there exists $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{C_n}$ for all $\mathbf{n}$. Necessarily, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}$. ■